

REMARKS

This Amendment is prepared in response to the Office action mailed on 24 July 2009 (Paper No. 20090719).

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 13-18 and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0077484 in view of Azema *et al.*, Japanese Patent Publication No. 2002-334685.

Claims 7, 9, 12, 19, 21, 24, 31, 33 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashita, Japanese Patent Publication No. 07-169506 in view of Aaltonen *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,824,917.

Claims 8, 10, 11, 20, 22, 23, 32, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashita '506 and Aaltonen *et al.* '917, and further in view of Azema *et al.* '685.

The claims have been variously rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious over Cho or Yamashita combined with one or two additional applied references for the reasons stated on page 3-8 of the Office Action.

By this Amendment, the independent claims have been revised since it is submitted that all the claims now present in the application are patentable over the applied references, taken either alone or in combination, for the following reasons:

The Examiner has apparently overlooked the recitation in the independent claims

that the lead plate is **pressfit** into either a cavity or a aperture.

Pressfit is a term of art meaning that the object being pressed into the cavity or aperture is the same size or slightly large than the cavity or aperture. Pressfit is often referred to as interference fit (another term of art).

In order to clarify the present independent claims, the claim now recite that the lead plate is tightly attached **by an interference fit** without welding **or** **an adhesive** to either the aperture or cavity.

The addition of these terms is not new since the term **pressfit** is essentially synonymous with **interference fit**. Further more, **pressfit** or **interference fit** precludes the use of welding or adhesive.

On the other hand, neither Cho nor Yamashita press fits the lead plate to the cavity or aperture but rather welds the lead plate to the electrode terminal (see paragraph [0055] of Cho) or utilizes a resin to attach the lead to the cavity (see the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action).

Furthermore, none of the other applied references teach or suggest the above-noted recited limitation deficient in Cho or Yamashita.

In view of the above, it is submitted that independent claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, and 31, as amended, and by their dependency the remaining claims, are patentable over the applied references, taken either alone or combination and should therefore now be in a condition suitable for allowance.

No other issues remaining, reconsideration and favorable action upon all of the claims now present in the application is respectfully requested. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney.

No fee is incurred by this Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert E Bushnell/
Robert E. Bushnell,
Registration No.: 27,774

Customer No. 008439
2029 "K" Street N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20006-1004
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P56999
Date: 10/23/09
I.D.: REB/HMZ